Date:

10/19/20

Agency Information

AGENCY:

RECORD NUMBER:

180-10110-10005

RECORD SERIES:

SECURITY CLASSIFIED TESTIMONY

AGENCY FILE NUMBER:

Document Information

ORIGINATOR:

HSCA

014719

HSCA

FROM:

[Restricted]

TO:

TITLE:

[Restricted]

DATE:

08/09/1978

PAGES:

198

SUBJECTS:

CIA, METHODOLOGY

OSWALD, LEE, POST-RUSSIAN PERIOD, TRAVEL, TRIP TO

RUSSIA [Restricted] [Restricted]

WC

DOCUMENT TYPE:

TRANSCRIPT

CLASSIFICATION:

Unclassified

RESTRICTIONS:

: 3

CURRENT STATUS: DATE OF LAST REVIEW:

Redact 01/01/2003

OPENING CRITERIA:

COMMENTS:

Two duplicates follow in next two folders and Box 3.Box 2.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 9, 1978

U.S. House of Representatives,

Subcommittee on Assassination of John F. Kennedy of the Select Committee on Assassinations,

Washington, D.C.

The Subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:25 a.m. in room 340, Cannon House Office Building, Hon. Richardson Preyer (Chairman of the Subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Preyer, Burke, Dodd, Devine and Sawyer.

Also present: E. Berning; L. Svendsen; C. Berk; M. Goldsmith; B. Genzman; J. Blackmer; J. McDonald; G. R. Blakey;
O. Wagner; B. Wolf; W. H. Cross.

Mr. Preyer. The Committee will come to order.

The Chair recognizes the Clerk of the Committee to read those who are officially designated to be on the Subcommittee today.

The Clerk. You, Mrs. Burke, Mr. Sawyer and Mr. Thone are regular members of the Kennedy Subcommittee. Mr. Devine will be substituting for Mr. Dodd.

Mr. Preyer. The Chair at this time will entertain a motion that today's hearings and one subsequent day of hearings be held

263410 Page 2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

The ecoes

in Executive Session since, on the basis of information obtained by the Committee, the Committee believes that the evidence or 2 testimony may tend to defame, degrade or incriminate people 3 and consequently Section 2(k)(5) of Rule 11 of the Committee 4 5 rules would apply. Ó Mrs. Burke. I so move. 7 Mr. Preyer. Thank you. You have heard the motion. All those in favor will answer 8 as the roll is called. 9 The Clerk. Mr. Preyer? 10 Mr. Preyer. Aye. 11 The Clerk. Mr. Devine? 12 Mr. Devine. Aye. 13 The Clerk. Mr. Thone? 14 (No response) 15 The Clerk. Mrs. Burke? 16 Mrs. Burke. Aye. 17 The Clerk. Mr. Sawyer? 13 (No response) 19 The Clerk. Three ayes, Mr. Chairman. 20 Mr. Preyer. Thank you. 21 The Committee will go into Executive Sesison at this time 22 and we will ask all those who are not members of the Committee, all witnesses to please leave the room at this time.

TAD CEADET

263410 Page 3

(Pause)

3

4

5

5

7

8

9

11

10

12

i4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

13

24.

25

Mr. Preyer. We will now proceed in Executive Session.

The Chair will ask the witness if he will be sworn at this time.

Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you are about to give this Subcommittee will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. Helms. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Preyer. You may be seated.

As we do to all witnesses, the Chair will give a brief statement concerning the subject of the investigation.

House Resolution 222 mandates the Committee to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the circumstances surrounding the assassination and death of President John F. Kennedy including determining whether the existing laws of the United States concerning the investigation of the President and the investigatory jurisdiction and capability of agencies and departments are adequate in their provisions and enforcement and there is full disclosure of evidence and information among agencies and departments of the United States government, and whether any evidence or information not in the possession of an agency or department would have been in assistance in investigating the assassination, and why such information was not provided by such agency or department; and to make recommendations to the House, if the Select Committee deems it appropriate, for amendment of existing legislation or the

Gregory

at this

1	enactment of new legislation.					
2	Mr. Helms, are you represented by counsel?					
3	Mr. Helms. Yes. I have with me, Mr. Chairman, Mr.					
4	B. Craig who is my counsel on this occasion.					
5	Mr. Preyer. Thank you.					
6	Mr. Craig. Good morning, Mr. Chairman.					
7	Mr. Preyer. The Chair will recognize Mr. Goldsmith					
8	time to begin the questioning.					
9	Mr. Goldsmith. Thank you.					
0						
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
13						
24						

iup strati

	. 1 - 5
1	TESTIMONY OF RICHARD MC GARRAH HELMS
2	Mr. Goldsmith. Mr. Ambassador, for the record will you
3	state your name and address?
4	Mr. Helms. My name is Richard McGarrah Helms, and for
5	the benefit of the Reporter, the middle name is spelled
ó	M-c G-a-r-r-a-h.
7	I live at 4649 Garfield Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.
â	20007.
9	Mr. Goldsmith. Have you previously served as the Director
0	of the Central Intelligence?
ì	Mr. Helms. Yes, I have.
2	Mr. Goldsmith. During what years did you serve in that
3	capacity?
4	Mr. Helms. I served from 1966 to 1973.
5	Mr. Goldsmith. Prior to that time, how many years have
lá	you been associated with the CIA?
17	Mr. Helms. Since the doors opened in 1947.
18	Mr. Goldsmith. As a part of your association with the CIA
19	were you required to execute a secrety seal?
20	Mr. Helms. I was.
21	Mr. Goldsmith. At this time I would like, Mr. Ambassador,
22	to present what has been marked as JFK Exhibit No. 94.
23	Mr. Helms. I have it in front of me. I have identified
24	it as a document that I read earlier.

TAD CLADET

Mr. Goldsmith. For the record, Mr. Chairman, JFK Exhibit

DocId: 32263410 Page 6

No. 94 is a letter from Acting Director Carlucci to the Chairman of this Committee which was written for the purpose of authorizing present and former agency employees to testify fully and truthfully before this Committee and to respond to questions that are within the scope of the Committee's mandate. At this time, I would like the Ambassador to be given a letter, or a copy of a letter, from Mr. Carlucci to the Ambassador dated July 27, 1978. I would request that this item be introduced into evidence as Exhibit No. 125, JFK Exhibit 125. (The document referred to was marked JFK Exhibit No. 125 for identification.) Mr. Helms. in the mail.

I would identify this letter as one I received

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you understand the contents of this letter and the previous letter that you were shown, JFK No. 94?

Mr. Helms. I believe I do.

Mr. Goldsmith. In addition, Mr. Ambassador, I would like you to examine JFK Exhibit 126, which is a letter dated 8 August 1978 to Mr. G. Robert Blakey, Chief Counsel and Director of this Committee.

Part of that exhibit consists of a letter from Mr. Scott Breckinridge of the CIA and another consists of a letter to

2

3

5

Ó

ô

10

11

12

13

14

15

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

Mr. Blakey sent by Mr. Anthony Lampvan, General Counsel of 2 the CIA. I request that be introduced into evidence as JFK Exhibit 126. Mr. Preyer. Without objection, so ordered. 5 (The document referred to 6 was marked JFK Exhibit No. 126 for identification.) 8 Mr. Helms. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I read this letter before 9 the meeting started this morning. 10 Mr. Goldsmith. Do you understand the contents of that 11 letter 12 Mr. Helms. I do. 13 Mr. Goldsmith. Finally, I have one more letter to intro-14 duce in the record, a letter from Mr. Blakey to Mr. Breckin-15 ridge dated 4 August 1978 which was sent to Mr. Breckinridge ló at the request of Mr. Gregory Craig, counsel for the Ambassador. 17 At this time, I request that that letter be introduced 18 into the record as Exhibit 127. Mr. Helms. Yes, I have seen this letter on another 20 occasion. 21 Mr. Goldsmith. Mr. Chairman, I request that this letter 22 be introduced into the record as JFK No. 127. 13 Mr. Preyer. Without objection, so ordered. Mr. Goldsmith. Thank you. 25

1 (The document referred 2 to was marked JKF Exhibit 3 No. 127 for identification.) Mr. Goldsmith. Mr. Ambassador, what was your position in 5 1963 when you were with the CIA? Mr. Helms. In 1963, I had the title Deputy Director for Ć 7 Plans. 8 Mr. Goldsmith. Would you explain to the Committee what the organization function of the Deputy Director for Plans was 10 in 1963? Mr. Helms. In 1963, the Deputy Director for Plans was 11 the Deputy Director who was in charge of -- I guess the simplest 12 term is overseas operations. This entity of the CIA received 13 its mandate from two documents, one known as MSC No. 5 and the other CID/2 or M-12. 15 In any event, the responsibility of this unit was to 16 conduct espionage and counter-espionage and covert action out-17 side the continental limits of the United States. 18 Mr. Goldsmith. Can you describe generally what your 19 responsibilities were as head of that unit? 20 Mr. Helms: I was, in fact, in charge of the unit. 21 other words, I was under the aegis of the Director of Central Intelligence, to whom I reported. I was in charge of overseas 23 operations. 24 Mr. Goldsmith. What role, if any, did the CIA have in the

investigation of the assassination of President Kennedy?

2

3

5

6

? a

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

51

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Helms. After this tragedy occurred and the Warren Commission was formed, there was every effort made in the Central Intelligence Agency to be as responsive as possible to request from the FBI who was conducting the investigation

or a major portion of it, and the staff and members of the

Warren Commission.

I would like to take this occasion to say we were all, I think, in this country equally struck with the tragic circumstances and we all felt, in the Agency, that we should do what we could to be as supportive as we possibly could of these other entities that had the lead in this investigation.

Mr. Goldsmith. Am I correct in assuming that -- and understand, your testimony to be -- that the basic role of the Agency at that time was to lend support to the FBI and to the Warren Commission?

Mr. Helms. Yes.

Mr. Goldsmith. Functioning in that capacity, how was the CIA's investigation organized?

Mr. Helms. This is a long time ago that these events took place. I guess it is all of 15 years.

I do not recall that, at the outset, that there was any formal organizational change made to accommodate this investigation. My recollection is that we figured that most of our contribution would focus on what had occurred in Mexico City --

in other words, Oswald's activity prior to the assassination in Mexico City.

It is my recollection that the individual who was sort of designated to help out from the Headquarters standpoint was the man who had the desk there in Mexico City. My recollection, his name was Whitten.

Mr. Goldsmith. Jack Whitten?

Mr. Helms. I think so. That is my recollection.

Mr. Goldsmith. What were your responsibilities with regard to the investigation that was undertaken by the Agency?

Mr. Helms. My recollection is that I felt my responsibility to be as responsive to whatever requests came from the FBI or the Warren Commission as we could. I, therefore, tried to see to it that these requests were fulfilled and that we made the requisite inquiry or whatever else would be required under the circumstances.

Mr. Goldsmith. Who, if anyone, was primarily responsible for coordinating the flow of information within the CIA to you and then from you to the Warren Commission?

Mr. Helms. Mr. Goldsmith, I do not recall, at this late date, anyway, any particular flow of information. An inquiry would come over. We would attempt to satisfy it and we would attempt to respond to it. But these inquiries came in individual bits and pieces or as individual items, and my recollection would be that it would be hard to describe this flow of

material. Each individual item that came along we took care of as best as we could.

As the weeks turned into months, we found that we were looking into matters overseas in Europe and various places, trying to run down individuals, identify bits and pieces that the Warren Commission was trying to clarify, and as a result of this, it was necessary to deal through all the area divisions of the so-called Operations Director, or Plans Director, at that time.

Mr. Goldsmith. Which staff or unit, if any, within the CIA was given primary responsibility for coordinating the investigation?

Mr. Helms. My recollection is that after the Warren Commission was established and it got its work underway that this was put into the counter-intelligence staff.

Mr. Goldsmith. Would you explain to the Committee what the organizational function or purpose of the counter-intelligence staff was?

Mr. Helms. Under the National Security Council intelligence directive, NSCID No. 5, there was a provision, a special
provision in that document which dealt with counter-intelligence.

I say a special provision, because in the area of positive
intelligence the Agency's charter was to collect raw information and then pass it to the various other interested agencies
of government.

ló

. 17

Whereas, in the counter-intelligence field, it had a mandate to maintain counter-intelligence files and also to do counter-intelligence evaluations.

To be more specific about this, if there was an allegation from the FBI that a spy at the United Nations had been transferred to some unit in Paris and it was the Agency's job, then, to try to see what that agent was up to. It was also the Agency's job to make an evaluation of whether he, indeed, was working for the Russians or the French or whatever the case might be.

Therefore, the counter-intelligence staff did have an evaluation function which the foreign intelligence staff, or the positive intelligence staff, did not.

Mr. Goldsmith. Is that why the CI staff was given primary responsibility for coordinating the investigation?

Mr. Helms. Mr. Goldsmith, I do not recall any longer what considerations went into giving this job to the counter-intelligence staff. I think it is logical to agree with what you say, but I do not recall any longer as it having been or what the controlling reasons were.

Mr. Goldsmith. You made reference earlier to Jack Whitten who originally was given responsibility to coordinating aspects of the investigation. Do you recall how long he retained this responsibility?

Mr. Helms. It is not only my recollection but in an effort

1-13 to clear my mind in preparation for this hearing, I did some checking with some former colleagues, and my recollection is that he sort of had the labor for only a couple of months; after that, the job was turned over to the Counter-Intelligence Staff. Do you recall why the transition was made from Whitten to the CI staff? Mr. Helms. I think, if recollection serves, that we could see that this investigation was broadening far beyond Mexico

City and it did not make much sense to have it in the hands of a man who was running the Mexico City desk.

Mr. Goldsmith. When Mr. Whitten was originally given the responsibility for coordinating the investigation, was he ever told by you that he would have exclusive control of the investigation?

I have no such recollection. I would see no Mr. Helms. reason to give him -- in fact, I could not see why it would have occurred to me to want to say that to him.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you recall whether Mr. Whitten ever discussed with you problems that he was having with Mr. Angleton's in some way interfering with the investigation?

Mr. Helms. No, I do not recall this. He might have. I do not recall this.

If you could identify what the troubles were, it might refresh my memory.

25

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CLUDIA

Mr. Goldsmith. Mr. Whitten has testified before the Committee in a deposition, and at that time he indicated that he was intially given responsibility for the investigation and was told more or less that he would be given free rein as to coordinating the information, and, I guess, sending it to the Warren Commission. He indicated to us that Mr. Angleton was in some way interfering with his function as coordinator of the investigation and that at some time the investigation was turned over from Whitten to Angleton. Does that refresh your memory at all? Mr. Helms. It does not, and may I say, I do not mean

to add to the questions I have not been asked, but I cannot imagine giving anybody the kinds of assurances which Mr. Whitten claims that he was given. We did not operate that way. Nobody had those assurances for anything, including me.

Mr. Goldsmith. Your position would be that the primary reason, as you recall it, for the investigation's being taken from Whitten, in a sense, and given to the CI staff was because the investigation began to undertake broader tones than was initially anticipated?

Yes. That is not only my recollection, but Mr. Helms. also it would seem to be in the year 1978, to have been a rather sensible thing to have done under the circumstances.

Mr. Goldsmith. Mr. Whitten also testified before the Committee that Mr. Angleton was talking to the FBI without

25

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

3

4

ó

.

8

9

10

, n

13

1 4

15

. •

16

17

0

19

20

21

24

.:3

25

receiving authorization from anyone. Do you recall whether or not that was a problem at any time?

Mr. Helms. Well, Mr. Angleton was responsibile for the liaison of the Plans Director for the FBI and consequently he talked to the FBI liaison man and other FBI people every day of the week and probably several times a day.

Mr. Goldsmith. He was never, after the assassination, instructed not to talk to the FBI while Mr. Whitten was coordinating the investigation?

Mr. Helms. Certainly not. We were doing our best to be as supportive and helpful as we could to the FBI.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did you serve as a point of contact between the Commission and the Agency, or was that responsibility given to someone else?

Mr. Helms. I do not know that anyone in the Agency was ever designated as point of contact. I had dealings with the Commission because I had the part of the Agency that was doing most of the work for the Commission. This was a situation indicated by the display of forces and activity rather than by anything else. I do not recall having been designated as a particular point of contact. I do not recall anyone else's having been designated as a point of contact.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you recall what responsibilities, if any, were given to Mr. Raymond Rocca?

Mr. Helms. I think in the counter-intelligence staff when

they took over this responsibility, if you want to call it that, I believe he was the man in the counter-intelligence staff that was responsible for pulling things together there.

In other words, these Warren Commission queries would go to his desk, and the replies would come back from his desk.

Mr. Goldsmith. What role, if any, did Mr. McCone have in the investigation?

Mr. Helms. As the Director of the Agency, he had a very important role. Everything we did was on his say-so and there was a constant traffic between him and me about what we were doing with the Warren Commission, how we were handling these various matters. I believe Mr. McCone testified at the Warren Commission at one time. We would have had to brief him in preparation for his testimony and prepare the papers and so forth. He had a very real role.

Mr. Goldsmith. He was actually apprised of the developments and what was being given to the Warren Commission?

Mr. Helms. Literally not on a day to day basis, but he was kept informed in general terms and specific terms if necessary.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you recall how many times a week you him would meet with Mr. McCone and discuss with them the developments with regard to the investigation of the assassination?

Mr. Helms. I am sorry, I do not. In the Agency procedure, there was a morning meeting with the Director every day, five

21

22

13

24

1

3

5

Ó

8

10

11.

12

14

15

.17

18

19

20 21

22

.3

75

days a week, and I was at those meetings. What transpired at those meetings plus what transpired in his office in private meetings, I could not conceivably give you any idea.

Mr. Goldsmith. In any event, you would say that Mr. McCone was actively apprised and was not on the periphery of the developments?

Mr. Helm. Certainly not. He was actively apprised. He was very much interested, and we were all very much interested.

Mr. Goldsmith. You made reference earlier to the division of responsibility in essence between the FBI and the CIA with regard to the investigation. Would you go into somewhat more detail as to the relationship between the CIA and FBI at that time?

Mr. Helms. This crime was committed on United States soil. Therefore, as far as the Federal government was concerned, the primary investigating agency would have been the Federal Bureau of Investigation without any question. The role of the CIA would have been entirely supportive and it would have been supportive in the sense of what material we are able to acquire outside the continental limits of the United States with reference to the investigation.

This was the division of labor between the FBI and the CIA.

The CIA's mandate started at the ocean front. Or, to put it

another way, the FBI's mandate started as soon as you crossed
into the continental limits of the United States. For

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

lá

17

13

19

20

21

13

24

25

investigative purposes, the Agency had no investigative role inside the United States at all. So when I used here the word "supportive," I meant that in the literal sense of the We are trying to support the FBI and support the Warren Commission and be responsive to their requests, but we were not initiating any investigations of our own or, to my recollection, were we ever asked to.

Mr. Goldsmith. In your opinion, was that division of responsibility satisfactory?

Mr. Helms. It was law. It was not a question of whether it was satisfactory or not; it was law.

Mr. Goldsmith. I understand that. One of the purposes of this investigation is to examine the state of the law at that time and the manner in which the Agency has gone about investigating the death of the President. So, at this time, I am asking you whether in your opinion that statement of facts was satisfactory towards conducting the investigation that was involved?

Mr. Helms. I do not know, Mr. Goldsmith, whether on such short notice I would want to make such a serious judgment as It does seem to me in any investigation that one organization has to have the primary role, otherwise you have a great deal of confusion. I think it was proper that the FBI should have the primary role in this case. I do not recall ever having felt disadvantaged in any way in the CIA

á

8

7

10

11

12

13 14

13

iá

17

18

19

21

20

22

73

24

25

by the position we had of supporting these efforts, and that is the best answer I can give you on such short notice.

Mr. Goldsmith. Do you recall whether there were any problems between the Agency and the Bureau in conducting the investigation?

Mr. Helms. The only matter that comes readily to mind was the difference in the evaluation of the material of the Soviet defector named Nosenko gave. My recollection is that what this man had to say when he arrived in the United States around the time of the assassination was passed by the FBI to the Warren Commission exactly as he said it.

The CIA was responsible for handling defectors after they came to the United States and did not feel that the bona fides or the good faith and credibility of this defector had been established at this stage of the game, and the Central Intelligence Agency felt it necessary to make that known to the Warren Commission.

There, indeed, there was a difference between the two agencies.

Aside from that substantive disagreement Mr. Goldsmith. in the day-to-day relationship of the Bureau, can you recall whether there were problems in terms of coordinating the investigation?

Mr. Helms. I do not recall any other problems.

Mr. Goldsmith. Was information freely passed between the

CIA and the FBI? By that, I mean the way the scenario is right now, the CIA is acting in a support function to the FBI. Was the FBI giving information to the CIA?

Mr. Helms. My best recollection is that there were not difficulties between the two agencies over this. As I said at the outset, we were doing our best to be supportive. We were passing along, I believe, everything that was relative.

I do recall when we got into certain sensitive areas a couple of times during the investigation, if we felt we could not pass a piece of paper to the Warren Commission, for example, we would go down and talk to the staff man to try to apprise them orally of what our predicament was.

In other words, I assure you, Mr. Goldsmith, that the whole thrust of the Agency was to be as helpful as we possibly could and to go over the edge, if necessary.

Mr. Goldsmith. I understand. In this case, my question was whether the FBI was also sending information to the Agency?

In other words, was the FBI sharing information for your purposes?

Mr. Helms. I do not recall any complaints on those grounds.

Maybe they were and maybe they were not. It is a little bit

difficult, sometimes, to know whether you are getting something

the existence of which you have never heard.

Mr. Goldsmith. Did the Agency's investigation reflect any working hypotheses? By that, did the Agency give any particular

.

1

2

3

5

Ó

7

8

10

 \Box

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

73

24

C

1-1 1-2

13.

emphasis to the particular areas, geographic areas?

Mr. Helms. I think that the entire United States government, not only the CIA, was very concerned as to whether there would be evidence of some foreign conspiracy to assassinate President Kennedy. They were concerned whether the Soviets were involved in this. They were concerned whether the Cubans were involved in this. They were concerned that somebody may have been involved in it.

I think we were all preoccupied with this. There is hardly any question there was more discussed during those days as to who was behind Lee Harvey Oswald, if indeed he was the man who was responsible, what had affected his life, why had he done the things he had done, and so forth.

think if the Chair would indulge me a minute, I would like to make a comment about the various investigations into the assassination of President Kennedy based on the long years I have spent in the intelligence business, and that is, until the day that the KGB in Moscow or the Cuban intelligence in Havanna is prepared to turn over their files to the U.S. as to what their relationships to these various people were, it is going to be extraordinarily difficult to tidy up this case, finally, and conclusively.

A great deal of investigation can be done, and has been done. It has been done conscientiously. I think people have

IUP DELIKEI tried over the years their very best to resolve a host of differences. I recognize also that allegations have been made that certain areas have not been as aggressively investigated as they might have been. That all may be true. But it really does not make any difference what is done in this connection until you can get those governments to lay before you their records of how they dealt with Lee Harvey Oswald, or anybody else who is relevant in this case. And, based on past experience, I doubt very much whether you are going to get the compliance of the Soviets or the Cuban government. But I want to make this comment, because it is extremely

important and very relevant, that these cases are untidy. is only in books that they end up with all the little things worked out at the end and tied off neatly.

This aura of suspicion and all the rest of it hangs in the air. Undoubtedly that is why this Committee was formed, so undoubtedly this could be put to rest. I promise you, there is this one last step and until it can be taken, this is never going to be laid to rest.

Mr. Devine. Do you agree, Mr. Helms, that the likelihood of that happening is remote?

Remote. Yes, sir, I agree with that. Mr. Helms.

Mr. Goldsmith. Mr. Helms, I believe my question was --

Mr. Helms. Excuse me, Mr. Goldsmith. I did not mean to

25

2

3

5

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

J0

11

12

13

14

15

16

.17

18

20

21-

22

13

24

25

digress. I thought that I would like to get this off my chest.

Mr. Goldsmith. I understand.

Myquestion was, what areas received primary emphasis. I think your answer, in part, was the area of foreign conspiracy.

Are you able to give any more detail on what aspects of the foreign conspiracy question were investigated?

Mr. Helms. I think we were very concerned about the Soviet aspects of this, primarily. Why? Because Lee Harvey Oswald had spent time in the Soviet Union, time which never had been satisfactorily explained as far as we knew.

Nosenko arrives as a defector. There were a lot of very suspicious circumstances surrounding the whole way and timing of his defection. So that there were several areas there that seemed to require not only investigation but thought and analysis and evetything else that could be given to it.

I would like to say here that when a tragedy of the magnitude of President Kennedy's assassination occurs in this country, it is at this point that in our international relations we have to suddenly become very careful, because accusing a foreign government of having been responsible for this act is tearing the veil about as nastily as one can, and this can lead to a whole series of counter-actions which might be very unpleasant.

I think all of us were keenly aware of this. It was not only true of the Soviet Union, but also true of Cuba, that